

The Reply

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

Second Year

May, 1915

Number Ten



CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER

The Tax Question

Hon. Everett P. Wheeler

The Portent of Feminism

Alex. Hamilton Church
(Industrial Engineer)

Senator O'Gorman's Attitude

Testimony of Experience

How Suffrage Works in New Zealand *F. G. R. Gordon*

The Wage Earner

Oh! Lady will you stop
At the "Little Vanity Shop?"



Take a Peep at
BLOUSES, GOWNS
Fresh from Paris
The Little Vanity Shop
346 Madison Avenue
At 44th STREET . . . NEW YORK
One Block from Grand Central Station

J. B. THILL
and
Mrs. EDMOND W. BODINE

Real Estate

192 Main Street
NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.
Telephone 848

30 East Forty-second Street
NEW YORK CITY
Telephone 6364 Murray Hill

TWO IMPORTANT ANTI-SUFFRAGE BOOKS

An Englishwoman's Home

Crown 8 vo.
Price by mail, 50c.
By M. E. S.

Mixed Herbs

A Working Woman's Remonstrance
Against the Suffrage
Agitation
Crown 8 vo.
Price by mail, 75c.
By the Same Author

London, Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd.
Agent for United States

THE REPLY

27 William St. New York

THE REPLY desires to enable canvassers to make money, perhaps not much but some, canvassing for subscriptions. Anti-suffragists everywhere are invited to think of this, and to send the names and addresses of any one who might like to help the cause and themselves at the same time. Please address Business Manager, The Reply, 27 William Street, New York.

The Reply

Edited and Published by Helen S. Harman-Brown

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 27 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK CITY

Subscription Price: \$1 Per Year; 10 Cents the Copy

Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

The Reply is on sale at Brentano's, Fifth Avenue and Twenty-seventh Street, New York,
and at Brentano's, Twelfth and F Streets, Washington

Editorial

By an incomprehensible fatuity, a number of very wealthy people, mostly women, possessors of fortunes of millions which they have inherited from fathers or husbands and which it is now proposed to spend the income or a part of the income of to propagate suffragism and socialism, have given thousands of dollars and will give other thousands and over into the hands of the suffrage politicians to spend as they please. Now and then a man will help with this. Not long ago, James Lees Laidlaw, the New York banker, was in Boston at a meeting called for the purpose of forming a committee of 100 to conduct the suffrage campaign in Massachusetts. This meeting was held at the home of Mrs. Oliver Ames on the invitation of Oakes Ames, and it has been said that Mrs. Ames has given \$25,000 to promote the political work of the suffragists. Another generous giver in Boston is Mrs. Quincy Shaw, who, it is said, also intends to give \$25,000 to promote female suffrage politics in Massachusetts. It is no wonder that at a single meeting in Tremont Temple \$4,000 of suffrage money was raised in twenty minutes; if the

wives and the widows of Boston's multi-millionaires open their purses, almost anything may be accomplished in the way of money raising. The safety of the situation from the standpoint of the antis arises, of course, from the fact that the electorate in the Old Bay State cannot be bought. Here in New York conditions are somewhat similar, though the female suffragists among us, no matter how rich, have been giving usually smaller sums than \$25,000. Mrs. Belmont is looked to for \$12,000 a year for the Congressional Union, being a kind of continuous angel. It is even more significant that Mrs. Elbert H. Gary, wife of the chairman of the board of the Steel Corporation, and Mrs. Marsden Perry of Providence, wife of the banker, should give each \$1,000, the former at least because Mrs. Belmont had interested her. It is not certain by any means that these ladies will not give other similar sums and that many others of similar associations with the wealthy and the powerful should not be published from time to time.

It ought to be of special interest to women like Mrs. Ames and Mrs. Shaw,

Mrs. Gary and Mrs. Perry, having their millions made in shovels, copper, steel and banking, that the Socialists of the country, organized or unorganized, and numbering a million voters, are all for female suffrage, and these revolutionists have boldly and repeatedly announced their determination during several years to destroy our present system of government and build upon it (if it can be called building) the new industrial commonwealth, whatever they mean by that. Only very recently, the woman's committee of the Socialist Party decided to unite with the Woman Suffrage Party. This is only a straw. The Socialists parade with the suffragists and mix their banners, one kind with the other. The newspaper organs of the Socialists are all for suffrage. Late in February, the *Daily Forward*, the Jewish Socialist organ of New York, issued a special edition of 200,000 copies, devoted largely to a votes-for-women propaganda. At the same time, the *Volks-Zeitung*, the German Socialist daily of New York, issued a special "woman's edition" for the same purpose and distributed 50,000 copies, of which 40,000 copies went into the homes of working men, largely in New York City. The *New Age*, a Socialist publication of Buffalo, has issued a special Socialist-Suffragist edition. The *New York Call*, the Socialist daily, gives attention in nearly every issue to its joint propaganda, Socialism and Female-Suffragism.

That "Taxation without representation," the slogan of the colonies in Revolutionary days, has no analogy to our present form of democracy has been often demonstrated. But the value of Mr. Wheeler's article in this issue is that it intensifies an impression of long stand-

ing that many of those who use the refrain not only are not familiar with its historical association and the import of its words, but also have never paid taxes.

If the spirit of maternalism should supersede the present democracy in the way which certain persons would seem to desire there would be no room for doubt as to the occupation of the floor. It is strange enough that the women of other states seem to know so well what the women of New York want, when the women of other States do not seem to know why they ask for equal suffrage. Some of them apparently have not enough to do at home or else will not do what they ought to do. But stranger still is the fact that some women of other States would try to force on the women of New York State what the great majority of women in New York State are sure they *do not want*.

Vote NO on the suffrage amendment in November.

The end of the suffrage movement may separate the sheep from the goats, but what will be done with those who are part sheep and part goat?

The question again recurs: If women want to vote, why do they oppose bills which would give the women in the given States a chance to record their wishes? Simple. They are in a minority and know it, and even think that they are gaining an advantage by refusing in this awkward or even idiotic manner to confess it.

"If," asks an interested anti, "a 'women's law' were passed against the will of a majority of men, how could the woman enforce it?" We shall not answer, even by the advice of counsel.

The Tax Question

By Everett P. Wheeler

The complaints about paying taxes that suffragists are making have led the Man-Suffrage Association, Opposed to Political Suffrage for Woman, to have a count. We find that in the Borough of Manhattan there are 7,054 males who pay personal tax, and 1,736 females. We have not completed our count of the record of the real estate owners. From A to J the number of males who own real estate is 14,245 and females 6,243. Estimating the number in the remaining letters of the record we find that there are about 49,000 persons who pay taxes directly to the city in the Borough of Manhattan. Some of these are aliens and some of them are minors. Of these classes the males do not vote, but that does not bar them from taxation. On the other hand, many of these persons who pay taxes here own property in other counties which is taxed there, but our laws do not permit them to vote there.

As against this number of 49,000 taxpayers, of whom only 14,236 are women, we have 257,880 voters in this Borough (last Presidential election). These figures illustrate the well-known fact that by the laws of this country property is not in any respect the basis for the suffrage. If these women who are objecting to paying for having the streets kept clean and lighted, for having the children taught in the schools, for having police protection for their persons and property, were to bring forward an amendment to the Constitution giving the right of suffrage to all taxpayers and limiting it to

them, we should have an entirely different proposition from that which is now before the people. We are to vote this Fall on a proposed amendment giving the right of suffrage to all women in the State who are over twenty-one years of age who are citizens. Many of them have become citizens, not by reason of any examination into their intelligence, or their loyalty to the country. Their husbands have had to undergo a rigorous examination on these points and also are required to have resided in the country five years. But their wives become citizens immediately their husbands are naturalized. This is one of the preferences which our laws give to women. The very basis of our whole system of legislation is a representative government in which all are represented, women as well as men, and in which the civil rights of all are protected, those of women equally with those of men. The woman has just as much right to be heard on questions of taxation as the man. If taxation is imposed unequally or illegally she has the same legal right as the man. Let us therefore discard all this confusing talk about taxation without representation and ask ourselves the plain question: Is it really for the interest and welfare of the State that the burden of the suffrage should be imposed upon 2,126,545 women in this State over the age of twenty-one who are citizens (census 1910), most of whom are already engrossed by their domestic duties which are more important to the welfare of the State than any political activity possibly could be?

The Portent of Feminism

By Alex. Hamilton Church

I. What Is Wrong With The Men?

The world, and in particular that portion of the world called New York State, is troubled to-day with a new portent, the meaning of which it cannot fathom, and in face of which it exhibits great confusion of thought and action. This portent is Feminism.

Feminism was yesterday a theory. To-day it is a clamorous, vibrant voice demanding it knows not what, and it is no answer to this to say that it wants the vote. Because a vote is only a means to an end. The end or aim of Feminism remains hidden even from its own vociferous champions.

Feminism, in as far as it means anything at all, is a claim that man is a failure. It is a claim that there exists or can be made to exist, a PLAN of LIFE superior to anything that man has ever thought of, or at any rate has ever succeeded in bringing about, and that this Plan can only be brought into being by surrendering the government of the world into feminine hands.

It would seem that women, as a sex, were discontented with men.

This discontent may or may not be justified, but even though it is, that is no proof that Feminism will be any cure. It may even aggravate the trouble.

Before we can discuss the remedies that Feminism would apply, let us first examine this charge against men. What is the matter with them? Is there anything the matter with them? It must be confessed that there is.

The greatest proof of this that considerable numbers of men are willing to

give way to the importunities of women without the slightest examination of the demands they make. This is a confession of irresponsibility, and of idle neglect of their duty as citizens.

The franchise is not a new kind of candy for responsible citizens and voters to give to their lady friends as a means of keeping them in good humor. Nor is it a treasure that man has selfishly kept to himself, and denied to women out of sheer stinginess. It is an engine of government that men have only slowly evolved through centuries, that they have given their life's blood for over and over again, for one purpose and one only,—to get the control of social welfare in their own hands.

What can be said of the man who is willing to yield up this control without the most careful inquiry into the sense of the demand, and without absolute assurance that the engine of government will not be greatly weakened and damaged thereby? If anything were desired to justify the contemptuous attitude of feminists towards men, it may be found right here—that they should be weakly willing to hand over the reins of power, smiling foolishly the while.

The first charge against the man of to-day is that he is irresponsible. He too willingly shrugs the shoulders, and puts the blame on the other fellow. Why is this? Why do men who have built up a great material civilization in a few short decades so readily abdicate their power, and exhibit signs of weakness and confusion, when great social and political issues are in question?

The answer to this may be found in

the substitution of emotion for precise thought that is a characteristic feature of to-day.

II. *The Decay of Manhood*

Feminism is to a large extent the protest of the onlooker. The onlooker, proverbially sees most of the game, but it has never been alleged that he, or she, can therefore play the game better than the players.

The evils of our present-day tumultuous, confused, boiling and bubbling life are very great. Our criminal record is appalling. Legislation has become a prey for faddists on the one hand and of argus-eyed "interests" on the other. A public man of high, serene, detached type would have no following whatever. From what comes this accumulation of disgusting ills? Simply from the decay of manly ideals.

Feminists wish to substitute feminine ideals, and what some of those ideals are we shall see by and by, but just now we must consider the decay of manliness.

The first duty of man is to have simple, clear, basic ideas of justice, of honor, and of right and wrong. All these ideas should be joined in a perspective that gives a true notion of the life that should be lived. Such a man has a calm self-respect, and cannot be cajoled or bulldozed into parting with his rights, any more than he wishes to invade the rights of others.

The reader, of course, recognizes himself in this picture, but how many of his friends does he recognize in it?

Has the average man of to-day clear ideas on any subject whatever beyond his business? I believe not. But it would be a great error to suppose that the woman of to-day has any clear ideas either. It is the confusion of ideas that robs men of their manliness and fur-

nishes women with a mask of feminism in place of womanliness.

In place of the clear judgment of the individual on the facts (and this is the basis of what is called "public opinion," and therefore of democracy itself), we are deluged with organized emotionalism. Whether a man shall drink a glass of beer, whether murderers shall be executed, whether criminals shall be punished or placed in comfortable retirement, whether women shall vote,—these and a thousand similar questions can no longer be decided by a man in the light of his own reason.

Each of them is agitated by a horde of excited, idle persons who form themselves into societies and quasi-public bodies, and exercise the art of advertisement for their fads (not forgetting advertisement for themselves) until the mental atmosphere of the average citizen may be compared to a whirlpool of conflicting ideas.

Emotionalism is the thought of the Feminist, but it is a sheer poison to manly decision.

Inasfar as organized emotionalism is encouraged and supported by men, so far do they fail in their duty as responsible supporters of the State. They thereby abdicate the throne of reason, and place themselves on a mental level with that sex which feels rather than reasons.

This is the reason for the decay of manly virtues and manly decisions. They no longer have exponents. They are no longer in fashion. No one speaks for them. There are no societies for their development. No one seeks notoriety by exploiting them. It is time this was changed. Why not a society for the Abolition of Ideas that are Upside Down?

III. *Ideas That Are Upside Down*

Take any well known truth, any maxim of conduct that has been worked out by the experience of society through centuries,—and invert it. On this simple plan you may found a society, call for subscriptions, and become a Power. Incidentally you will have succeeded in rendering the problem of successful government more difficult than ever.

To do all this it is important that you should possess a one-sided brain. No high type of mind could possibly hope to succeed in this work. You must not have any doubts as to your own infallibility. You must not be able to admit that there are two sides to your question. You must be a loyal worker for Good—never mind if infinite evil is really the result of our propaganda.

This country and time is afflicted with a legion of just such mental dynamiters as these. It would not be fair to suggest that they are mostly women, though women are their fondest devotees and furnish most of their funds. On the contrary the leaders are generally men—men to whom the Inquisition must be an ever present regret, and its methods their favorite subject of reading. But not all men are noble, wise and good.

Though these societies and movements are legion in number, and their operations extend over some degrees of latitude, there is a strong family likeness among them. They are all Inversions. They are all founded on one or two principles—either they strive to take some right or some pleasure away from someone, or they desire to exalt the weak at the expense of the strong, or the bad at the expense of the good.

Consider Prohibition. The very name stamps it as a tyranny. The very name

shows its blood relationship to despotism. That a man should voluntarily abstain from strong drink may be very noble or very silly according to circumstances, but that any man should arrogate the right to prevent others drinking is a subversion of democratic principles. It is a negation of human rights. There can be no two ways of regarding such an act.

It is, of course, a simple Inversion. Because in all times and in all places men have brewed and comforted themselves with fermented drinks, therefore it is wrong. It has been done from the beginning, therefore it must not be done in future. Because unhappy men abuse it, therefore normal men must suffer. That is the regular mode of reasoning of the Mental Invert.

The abolition of Capital Punishment and the coddling of the criminal is another type of Mental Inversion. It substitutes the murderer for the victim as the proper object of emotional gush. It strives to make the criminal comfortable while the victims of his crime suffer in silence, and no society occupies itself with assuaging their wounds. A society for assisting the victims of criminal practices would have no support; it would lack the necessary excuse of Upsidedownness.

Space forbids attention to numberless other movements of the Inverted order. There remains WOMAN SUFFRAGE. Is this also a simple Inversion? There are reasons for claiming it to be just that, and it appears to combine both varieties of the species—the taking of something away, and the exaltation of the weak at the expense of the strong. It takes away the age-long right of man to be considered the head of the family—and possibly wishes to destroy the family itself—and it exalts the less powerful

organism of the female at the expense of the more powerful organism of the male.

IV. *Feminism as Mental Inversion*

Every movement must be judged by its fruits. What are the fruits of Feminism? Does it induce sanity, logic, and reasonableness in its followers, or are they distinguished by excitability, the doing of bizarre, queer things, and by obsession of one idea to which everything must be sacrificed?

The answer must be that Feminists do appear to be abnormally excitable, that they do delight in queer, bizarre things, and that they are obsessed by one idea—that of sex.

Feminists on this side of the ocean disclaim the wild moods, the destructive fury and folly, and the criminal acts of their English sisters in a half-hearted way. They say that these extremes are not "necessary" here. But is there any case in which they have pointed out the immorality of these methods? Is there any case in which they have claimed that under no circumstances would they be tempted to follow in the footsteps of the English "furies?" But Feminism is not one thing here and another thing there. Its basic idea—revolt against the limitations which Nature has placed on their sex—is the same all over the world.

Feminists have not yet descended to the level of their English sisters in the doing of queer, bizarre things. They have not yet chained themselves to the railings of the White House, nor have they raided the Legislature hidden in furniture vans. But we have already heard of "hikes" in which young women make themselves a spectacle for the world to gape at. What argumentative value is there in a troop of bedraggled girls wearily tramping along a highway?

None whatever. It is an appeal to sex-emotion and nothing else. It is an appeal to the pity and chivalry of men that is in itself a confession that no rational basis of appeal exists.

Are Feminists obsessed by one idea—that of sex? Unquestionably. They think and talk of nothing else. Is there a single instance on record where Feminists have fulminated against the shortcomings and defects of their own sex? Is it not the fact that the Feminists are Antis also—the most unnatural kind of Antis—for they are Anti-man. This is a pure case of Mental Inversion.

The obsession becomes at times almost a frenzy. It produces hallucinations. The "poison needle" epidemic of a year or so ago is an instance of this. The poison needle story appears to have been started at a Feminist gathering in New Jersey; it spread like wildfire. Victims were discovered every day. It was an absolute hoax, and presently died down and was forgotten. But it no doubt served its purpose. No doubt the "cause" benefitted.

Put against all this froth and excitement the picture of the family (of the typical family even of these days, in spite of Feminism and its influence on discontent and divorce). Which is the more noble path of duty for women, that of content with the lot which Nature and not man has imposed on them, or wild clamoring for "freedom?" For what is this freedom? What must be its nature? Already we hear demands for the right of being "unmarried mothers," we hear demands for the subsidizing of motherhood by the State, so that women shall not need to submit herself to any particular man longer than her fancy prompts. In so far as these demands are not simply due to a craving for license, what are they?

They are Mental Inversions, easily constructed by considering what is natural and good, and then crying out for the exact opposite.

V. *Feminism and Motherhood*

Feminism, we are sometimes told, is a sacred cause because it is the cause of Motherhood. When its followers are not crying out for license, and are not occupied in cataloguing the sins of men, they are immensely preoccupied with Motherhood. A great part of their propaganda gains its strength from the fact they hide behind the skirts of the mothers, and wave their little flags so as to give the impression that the mothers are on their side.

No rightminded, unpervverted mother is on their side.

The true mother has, from the very act of parentage, acquired the sense of perspective. Not the young mother, with her first infant, but the mature, wise mother whose children are growing up around her, is the one who knows how difficult a thing life is, and what an amount of give and take is necessary in this world.

Feminism cannot be identified with motherhood, for motherhood means sacrifice, and Feminism is "all take and no give." For Motherhood to become identified with a selfish and egotistical influence like Feminism would be a great misfortune for the mothers—and for the children.

How many of those who exploit motherhood as an emotional appeal are unmarried women and childless women? How many of the champions of Feminism are women who have made a hash of their own lives? How many of them are divorcees? How many are women whose matrimonial ventures have in some way come to grief? How many of

them, in short, belong to types that are discontented by nature, natural rebels, to whom this opportunity of working off gall is a godsend? These are important questions to have answered before we allow Feminists to speak in the name of motherhood.

But motherhood itself is, after all, but a means to an end. The sacredness of the mother is not derived from herself. Apart from the child the woman has no special significance. And this significance is due to the helplessness of the child, and the need for long-continued self-sacrifice of her own personality on the part of the mother.

Anything that imperils the interests of the child overrules things that merely imperil the interests of men or women, because the child represents the future, and all our instincts bid us safeguard the future. If Feminism claims that a new type of motherhood is necessary, subsidized, irresponsible motherhood, we may well ask "What of the child?" Are the interests of the child to be sacrificed to the interests of the woman? If so, the proposal is hideous and immoral.

Feminism frequently seeks to disclaim the influence of the father. A woman's club in the Middle West was reported some time since to have protested against the adoption of a "Father's Day" on the ground that Fathers didn't count. Apart from the interesting example of sex-obsession and mental inversion that this precious resolution exhibits, the wickedness of this attitude is only second to its ignorance. For fatherhood is the latest and most abstract form of human love that has come into the world.

Motherlove is shared by humans with a great part of the animal creation. Fatherlove is a peculiarly human characteristic. The higher the race of men, the more developed is Fatherhood.

When Feminists desire to eliminate the Father's influence, they show a desire to return to the standards of animal morality.

Motherhood and Fatherhood together are the birthright of the human child, and whosoever tries to diminish the influence of either is an enemy of humanity, and a being in whom the animal prevails over the human instincts.

VI. *The Indulgence of Women*

Feminists claim that women are down-trodden folk, that law, custom and everyday practice discriminate against them, and that their excuse for revolt is a very deep and just one.

It is not too much to say that this is absolutely untrue in this country and at this day. What is really the matter with society is not the want of woman's influence, but its enormously disproportionate outpouring in every department of human life. Woman has found, chiefly by means of the daily newspaper, that it is possible for her to hold the middle of the stage almost continuously, and she has availed herself to the full of the opportunity.

The sinister influence of political clubs in the French Revolution has been recognized. The equally sinister influence of woman's clubs is yet unrecognized. But a little inquiry would reveal its importance. These institutions have given point to the traditionary tendency of women to concern themselves with the affairs of others, to gossip over the actions of their neighbors, and to exercise spite and malice—the equivalent in women of the tendency to break out into dissipation that characterizes men. Of the two the feminine form of dissipation is infinitely the more dangerous.

It is the strength of the Feminist

movement that it has exploited this weak spot in the feminine character. The active world is present to woman's consciousness not through principles, but through personalities. Woman does not construct, she blames, or she praises. She is the typical onlooker, with all the limitations as to understanding of the spectacle that distinguishes the onlooker. Her sympathies, as her antipathies, are centered in the personages of the procession of life. And as to these her judgments are largely snap judgments—shrewd, swift and inaccurate.

In the club, all these impulses find an agreeable outlet. In such clubs there are usually one or two who correspond closely with the ancient and venerable type of busy-bodies. These intrigue and whisper, and stir up the more wholesome and womanly members to action. To most women the idea of influencing public affairs without any particular effort is very attractive, hence it becomes easy to commit the club to outrageous absurdities like the resolution about Fatherhood cited in the last article of this series. But the mischief, the irresponsible mischief does not end here.

These clubs form centers from which radiate influences tending to the subverting of all law and order. They are the strongholds of mental inversion. The case of a murderess in a nearby State whose deserved fate was prevented by a vast and concerted uprising of club-women will be recollected by many readers. In some States the constant interference of those organized busybodies with the work of legislation has been declared to amount to a condition of "bedevilment." The quick, eager minds of women prompt them to rush in where a responsible and sober man would fear to tread; they cloud counsel but do not assist calm judgment.

The truth is that we hear far too much of women in these days. They are spoiled and indulged to an extent that is very harmful. I do not refer to personal and individual indulgences, that is a private matter. But that women are

listened to and encouraged where they have absolutely nothing of value to add to discussion is a universal evil, which is in need of being diminished, rather than increased by encouraging them to enter politics.

The Kentucky women on trial for selling their votes evidently need the attention of some influential economist like Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr. They sold their votes for a dollar, the men asking two dollars and probably getting it. It is a little too early to say with confidence that competition among the women broke the price, and for this reason all the more the matter requires the attention of some one, preferably an influential woman economist who has been working alongside of men for seventeen years but seems not to have been able to demonstrate that she was worth as much.

The antis do not have to parade now, but they will all turn out in November, and they will have fathers and husbands and brothers and sons turn out with them.

It was only natural, in view of the unconscionable array of falsehoods which the Suffragists of Connecticut "handed out" in their recent "campaigning" that they should not have had the ghost of a chance before the Legislature. If their case had reached the people it might have been under similar circumstances that they would have had no votes at all.

Mrs. Catt now appears likely to come into the Leslie millions for the propagation of votes for women. This ought to enable the lady to subscribe for *The Reply*, which will contain during the campaign a great deal of wholesome truth that Mrs. Catt ought in justice to her great influence and wealth to be familiar with.

"Now," says Louise Connelly (Miss or Mrs.?) in a woman suffrage edition of the *Evening World* rather strangely, "it is the women who are queer. What can it be that ails them?" Nothing is the matter with the most of them. As to what is the matter with a few of them, we give it up.

If Senator O'Gorman was "unutterably" opposed to a Federal amendment granting the vote to women as well as unalterably opposed, he will find that the voters of New York are ready and willing to make it unanimous for O'Gorman.

Alice Duer Miller is suspected of having tried to get us to believe that if only women were permitted to vote, the gallantry of men would cause them to raise the pay of all women workers to the men's wages level.

"We" are only a woman, but if Senator O'Gorman would like our advice we would warn him not to have his picture taken too often in company with suffragettes, especially if they are militants from abroad and divorce lawyers from home.

Senator O'Gorman's Attitude

Addressing a delegation of suffragettes at his office at No. 37 Wall Street, on April 30th, Senator O'Gorman said:

"Ladies, I am glad that I have had the opportunity of meeting you and listening to the vigorous and eloquent presentation of your views on this much discussed question. I have great respect for the women of the country who are devoting their time and energy to the advancement of this movement, but much as I applaud your public spirit, I am unable to respond to your call to support the cause in which you are so ardently enlisted. I supposed my attitude on this question was well known, for I have frequently declared that I was opposed to any and all proposals for woman suffrage by amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

"It has been the doctrine of the Democratic Party since the inception of the government that all such matters should be left to the States, and I cannot on principle support an amendment which would deprive the States of the regulation of the suffrage and confer it upon the Federal Government. The Constitution of the United States did not prescribe the qualifications of suffrage. In the Convention that adopted the Constitution it was determined by the venerable men that framed that great instrument, that the question of suffrage belonged to the States and was not to be dictated or exercised by the Federal Government.

"States that want woman suffrage can bestow it now as freely and as effectively as the Federal Government could if the Federal Constitution were amended for that purpose. The sole effect of the proposed amendment seems to be to force woman suffrage on the States that are opposed to it. I cannot favor this compulsory method. It violates every principle of home rule or local self-government. This question, in my judgment, should be settled by each State for itself. If this amendment is as meritorious as its advocates contend, they should be willing to allow each State to determine the question for itself.

"I am opposed to unnecessary changes in the Constitution. We have lived and prospered under it for more than one hundred

and twenty-five years. It has stood the storms and tempests; it has survived the vicissitudes of wars and conflicts; but under its wise and beneficent provisions we have become a mighty nation. Prudence admonishes us to be slow in removing ancient landmarks. Why should we abandon a system of government under which people, men and women, have enjoyed a measure of prosperity, happiness and progress, unparalleled among the nations of the world?

"If this amendment were submitted to the people of the country, it would be adopted if it secured the approval of thirty-six States, that being three-quarters of the entire number. The remaining twelve States would then have imposed upon them a governmental policy against which their protests would be of no avail, and this might result in a majority of the people being compelled to yield to the demands of a minority, because there are twelve States, including New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Ohio, which contain fifty-five per cent. of the population of the United States, while the other thirty-six States, which would be sufficient to carry the amendment, represents but forty-five per cent. of the entire population.

"Whenever a constitutional amendment is submitted to the country, New York is at a disadvantage. Although we have ten per cent. of the entire population and contribute much more than ten per cent. of the entire cost of maintaining the Federal Government, we count but one in the vote of the forty-eight States. On such an issue, the eighty-one thousand inhabitants of Nevada are as influential as the ten million inhabitants of the State of New York.

"For these reasons, I should consider it my duty to oppose any amendment to the Constitution of the United States not imperatively demanded by the people of my State. With regard to this question, no such demand has yet manifested itself. Under the Constitution, every State reserves control over its own affairs and over its own government. To permit the Federal Government to interfere with the suffrage is to destroy the fundamental rights of the States. As a Senator from the State of New York, I have no right to sur-

render any of her fundamental State powers, and I am unwilling to deprive other States of their fundamental State powers.

"Since every State can adopt woman suffrage if it so desires, I can see no necessity whatsoever for this change in the Federal Constitution. The eleven States that have woman suffrage adopted it without compulsion or coercion. Why should other States be deprived of the same privilege? Why should States that do not want woman suffrage be compelled to accept it because other States favor it? Those States that have adopted woman suffrage have done so without the need of an amendment to the Federal Constitution; the remaining States may do likewise if they are so inclined.

"It is true that the Constitution has been amended so as to provide an income tax and to permit the direct election of United States Senators; but these amendments were necessary, because these reforms could not be accomplished by the States alone. Moreover, they had a direct and necessary relation to the Federal Government itself. And the Democratic Party in State and National Convention had pledged the Party to their support.

"The Fifteenth Amendment, which was designed to enfranchise the negroes, was adopted under extraordinary circumstances. It was a war measure and an incident to the abolition of slavery.

"These changes in the Constitution of the United States offer no excuse or justification for the proposed amendment. I recognize the great importance of the question of woman suffrage, but it is equally important that there should be no needless interference with the rights of each State to regulate the suffrage according to the judgment of its own citizens. The population of the eleven States that have already adopted woman suffrage is relatively small. In at least one of them there are more square miles than inhabitants, and the entire population of the eleven States is two million less than that of the State of New York.

"Nothing that has been said here to-day

has altered my judgment that this is purely a State question. Entertaining these views, I regret that I cannot become an advocate of the plan to amend the Federal Constitution in the manner proposed."

The suffragettes themselves spoke with much uncertainty as to their terrifying intentions. Miss Lucy Burns promptly announced from Washington that Senator O'Gorman was "in very bad" with the suffragists; they would now regard him as their enemy and they threatened "to go after his scalp." Other suffragettes, evidently taking a less militant attitude than the Washington veterans of the Pankhurst wars, sought, rather adroitly, to soften the blow which the Senator had struck. Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch (daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton) even spoke approvingly of what the Senator had done, and Miss (or Mrs.?) Carrie Garrett Hay took sides with her.

Senator O'Gorman has received from hundreds of influential, though perhaps in some cases inconspicuous citizens of New York State, letters of commendation and thanks for his courageous stand and his statesmanlike view. Resolutions of commendation and thanks have been passed, one of them by the Man Suffrage Association, comprising in its Executive Committee some of the most influential Democrats and Republicans in the States, unanimously declaring:

"That the State of New York is to be congratulated upon the manly and patriotic stand taken by its Senator, Hon. James A. O'Gorman, in refusing all aid to the suffragists in their scheme to force woman suffrage upon the States by means of a constitutional amendment."

The Wellesley College girls will doubtless know better next time. They go to a meeting for the purpose of hearing a

discussion of the votes-for-women question and then all get enumerated among the suffragists!

The Testimony of Experience

Australia

News that is news and yet is old continues to reach us from Australia. A late report was made in London by a Mrs. Vickery, "a prominent worker in the cause of social reform in New South Wales." Mrs. Vickery said:

I am not against woman suffrage in principle, but I wish to tell you how little it has done in New South Wales. My experience there is that the educated women as a whole think very little about the vote, and ignore their responsibilities in connection with it. In spite of all the efforts that are made to arouse women's interest in politics, the greater portion of the female clerks and professional girls will not take the trouble to go to the poll. In cases when a holiday has been given them on polling days in order to induce them to register their vote, less than a quarter of those who were thus enabled to vote cared to go to the poll, the others all going off on excursions. Not once since women got the vote have they combined for the furtherance of legislation for women and children. Woman suffrage has simply forwarded the most socialistic form of legislation. Socialism is the only gainer.

It is quite astounding to us Australians to hear and see the women who are put up here to talk about the result of woman suffrage in Australia. Not one of them really knows anything about social work; they have never done any. They like to talk and stump the country and boast about women; they never take the trouble really to do anything for social reform. I hear women say that the possession of the vote would make women act up to their responsibilities. I say that has not happened in Australia; they ignore their duties. Then I hear that woman suffrage will purify politics. That is not my experience. Women will not bother themselves about it at all. At the last election in which I took part the register rolls were falsified, and names forged, and not a woman raised her voice in protest. I have known an official elected who had been in gaol for false witness, and he got his post through the women's votes.

I have worked for temperance and social reform for years and years, but have not received any more help from women since they voted than before. I hear suffragists say that women's vote put an end to sweating and helped the moral question. It is not true. We never had and never could have sweating as you know it here, but such under-payment as existed was put an end to through the private voluntary exertions of Miss Rose Scott—it had nothing whatever to do with women's votes. The age of consent was raised, and how? By many of us going on deputations to the officials, and they told us we must get up petitions, and we got them; we slaved ourselves to get signatures, and when we had got enough we sent them in, agitated, and made the officials see that the public were on our side, and they raised the age. They were not against us, they only wanted the public to express themselves. No vote helped us; it was all private work.

I have come back to England after some years, and now I ask women, what are you doing for temperance or social reform, or whatever they say their interest is? And they all say, "Oh, we are working for the suffrage." If they only knew what I know, and had experienced what I have experienced they would know what a sham it all is. They are leaving the real work for an empty cry. Women's votes don't bring about reforms; it is women's endeavors and hard struggles against evils. Government listens to women far more when they have not got the vote, because it knows there is no party to think about. Women do not do away with the excesses of party; their votes make it worse.

A committee of the National Association of Manufacturers recently returned from Australia. Reporting generally upon industrial conditions, it has the following in reference to woman suffrage:

In the matter of political franchise in Australia, the right to vote at all elections is extended to women equally with men, and, as this right of franchise is of long standing, the argument that woman suffrage will purify

politics and better the condition of women does not hold good in these countries. We discussed this question with many men and women, in both New Zealand and Australia, and found no one who did not express the opinion, substantially, that the votes of women were more responsible for the unfavorable industrial conditions than any other influence, for the reason that the political power of the organized forces was doubled by the women's vote, while the vote of the unorganized classes was not proportionately increased because of the indifference and apathy of the women of these classes, particularly among the society women, who take but little or no interest in political matters. In fact, so far as our observations extended, the interests of women would be the better safeguarded if left entirely in the hands of the men. To us, a most lamentable spectacle of disrespect for womanhood is the general custom of "barmaids" in the saloons of Australasia, in most of which women, instead of men, dispense the liquors. If woman suffrage means anything at all, it should never permit the existence of a system so degrading to womanhood as the passing out of beer and whiskey over saloon bars, and the fact that such is the common custom throughout Australasia, where for many years women have exercised the right to vote, does not warrant the claim that woman suffrage is either beneficial or elevating to womanhood. So far as we could ascertain, Parliament has not enacted a single law especially beneficial to or at the instance of women during its existence. Social industrial justice has not been advanced by the votes of women, else class domination and color discrimination would have ceased.

HOW SUFFRAGE WORKS IN NEW ZEALAND

By F. G. R. Gordon

It is a well known fact that about the only women who take an interest in voting in New Zealand are the socialists, wives of the radical socialistic Labor Party and the like. It is the almost universal testimony of all that the farmers' wives and the clerks and professional women, with the exception

of the few paid or professional agitators, refuse to vote. This, of course, naturally gives the Labor Party political control. Election days are holidays in New Zealand, yet, instead of voting, the clerks and the best educated women go off on excursions. There is not a case on record in New Zealand, where the women have combined their vote for furtherance of legislation for women and children; but they have been enabled to unite the socialistic women and men for the worst kind of class legislation.

After twenty years of woman suffrage in New Zealand we find the statute books filled with insane legislation of a socialistic brand. As to the social evils, what has woman suffrage done? Nothing. The saloons of New Zealand are open 24 hours a day (and they are in Australia also) and bar maids are the rule in all the larger towns. You may say this is "English, you know," but that doesn't answer the question. The fact of the matter is that not one great reform has been brought about in that country after twenty years of suffrage, and red light districts flourish everywhere. Moreover, we hear of all sorts of political crimes in New Zealand, such as ballot-box stuffing, forging of names for voting, false registration, and so on. Then when we come to the results of this cause, after twenty years of trial, we find that N. Z. has the greatest debt in all the world. It would take \$1,800 per family to pay the national debt of New Zealand to-day. It would take only \$50 in this country, which shows you in a nut shell how they have "progressed" in wonderful New Zealand, under suffragism. New Zealand spends a whole lot of cash to induce immigration but without success. If she was the "paradise" which the suffrage ladies would like to have us believe, there would be

an enormous immigration into that country. Socialism is the only cause that has benefitted by woman suffrage in New Zealand.

California

Now here is a statement from a California lady:

I feel I was in a measure instrumental in bringing suffrage in California, and I want to tell you that if I had it to do over again I would work twice as hard against it.

It is the constant agitation of the same few going about the country that keeps the question before the public and leads some to think the desire for it is general.

Suffrage robs women of all that is gentle, tender, and attractive.

On the good, intelligent woman in the home, rearing her children, with a sense of responsibility and duty, depends the welfare of the Nation. The struggle, strife, contention, bitterness, heart burnings, excitement, agitation, disappointment of politics are not for women. A child has a right to have one parent from whom to inherit the finer qualities of being.

Los Angeles, Cal.

MISS ANNIE BOCK.

Colorado

A LETTER TO A FRIEND FROM A LEADING LAWYER OF DENVER

Denver, Colorado, March 25, 1914.

My dear———:

Many people ask as to the experience of Colorado in the matter of Woman's suffrage, and it is not easy to give a clear answer. I am opposed to it, not because I think it has done any distinct harm, but because I feel clear that it has not done any distinct good.

In small communities where local officers are to be elected, I do think the votes of the women have been used to prevent thoroughly immoral men from being elected, and to that extent good has been accomplished. On the other

hand, in the cities I think the very worst element of the women, who are under the control of the police and party machine, have been brought out to vote unanimously for the support of the machine then in control, and to this extent harm has been done. This vote of the bad women is not entirely offset because the good women do not vote in the same proportion that the good men do. The majority of the women I think usually vote, but the proportion of women who vote to those who might vote is less than the proportion of men who vote to those who might vote. I think, too, that the women do not vote with the same regularity year after year that the men do.

Very many women whom I know vote from a sense of duty and not from a desire to do so, feeling that if the law allows them to be voters they ought to cast their votes as wisely as they know how. Those women, however, would much prefer not to have the suffrage, and to be free from that obligation. A good many others whom I know decline to vote at all unless they can see, or are told, that there is some emergency, in which case they vote as their husbands or fathers ask them to. In fact in the majority of cases, so far as my experience goes, the women in voting follow in general the advice of husbands or fathers, feeling that they have not the means of ascertaining the character of candidates that the men have.

There are, of course, some ardent believers in woman's suffrage who do vote regularly and think that in some way it has accomplished great good. I personally am unable to see what good has been accomplished. Politics have certainly not been purer in the twenty years of woman's suffrage than they were before, nor have any good laws been passed

or laws that are what are called progressive laws for the protection of women and children, that are due at all so far as I can see to woman's suffrage. Many such laws have, of course, been passed in the last twenty years—some wise and some unwise, but similar laws have been passed in other states, where women's suffrage does not exist, and in the majority of cases I think our laws have followed the adoption of similar laws in other places, just as they would have done if woman's suffrage had not existed.

I do not agree with those opponents of woman suffrage who say that the character of women has been injured thereby. I cannot see that it has made the women less womanly, or hurt them in any way. There are, of course, loud and disagreeable women who engage in politics, but the same women would have been loud and disagreeable and were so before. On the other hand, there are good and modest women who firmly believe in the suffrage and take very active part. I am unable to understand their point of view, but it is not fair to them or to the women in general to say that the suffrage has made them less womanly.

So far as my personal experience goes, the great majority of women are indifferent to the right. Most of them exercise it because they have it and they go with their husbands to vote. Very many of them wish they did not have it, and many more regard it with entire indifference.

The suffragists are distributing 500,000 copies of a votes-for-women speech by Congressman Mondell of Wyoming, all under the frank, of course. This is great work—until you come to think that while there may have been Congressional

I should be sorry to see woman's suffrage adopted in Massachusetts, and am sorry when it is adopted in other places, not because I think it does any definite harm, but because I am convinced that in most communities the large majority of the women are either indifferent to it or opposed to it; it does impose a burden and duty upon women and there is no corresponding benefit derived from it. There is, of course, too, some increase in the expense of conducting elections, but this is a comparatively small matter.

H. F. May.

ANOTHER MIND CHANGED

Judge Snell of Tacoma says:

"I favored woman suffrage in Washington and voted for it. But, in common with thousands of others who looked at the question as an abstract proposition, and hoped for the best, I am so greatly disappointed at the way it has worked out that I would to-day welcome an opportunity to vote for its withdrawal; and I believe if it were resubmitted to the people of Washington, and every man and woman of voting age were compelled to vote upon it, woman suffrage would be defeated by an overwhelming majority.

"Many of us were led to support woman suffrage in Washington by the familiar argument that it would tend to purify politics and make for better government. But, after four years of experience we are forced to conclude that it has done neither. On the contrary, it has simply added to the numbers of those who can be used in the interest of corrupt politics, and has resulted in a hodge-podge of ill-digested, sentimental, socialistic legislation, which is a menace to the welfare of the State."

speeches that the defenseless voter received and may possibly read, it does not follow that anything like that would happen in a case of an address of six or eight hours by the distinguished and able gentleman from Wyoming.

The Wage Earner

Boston anti-suffragists have issued among their numberless excellent frontal and flank attacks upon the suffragist folly a couple of statements by the working women

The following extracts are from a letter written by a working girl to the St. Louis Republic: "We working women are never asked to take part in any suffrage movement. The anti-suffragists have seen to it that we have reading rooms and a Y. W. C. A. where, as you know, the working girl may fit herself for better work and better wages.

"At the present time I am employed by a suffrage worker, who pays me my salary monthly, so the agreement was. I get my salary once in six weeks if Madame's monthly donation to the cause is not too large.

"I am off every other Thursday if Madame does not have company to luncheon on my day out. Sunday afternoon is also my day out, but when I get home of an evening I must wash a barrel of dishes before I seek my humble third-floor back to have my sleep disturbed by dreams of the next day's wash.

"When I worked for an anti I went to church and was at liberty to go when my duties were ended for the day. I am wondering if any condition could be worse than that under which the working girl must live.

"You organized a campaign to help the boys on the farm to get a better education in farm work. Why can't you investigate and give the working girls some kind of help? Suffrage won't do it."

Miss Josephine Casey, an industrial organizer from Chicago has been engaged for a year as an agitator by the New York suffragists. A working girl

herself and of wide experience of labor conditions, Miss Casey is honest enough to admit that working women are not handicapped by lack of the vote in attempting to improve their conditions. She says:

"For years past, women of the industrial world have been working shoulder to shoulder with men in bettering their conditions. The sex distinction has been practically forgotten. Together they have raised their wages, shortened their hours, improved the hygiene of their factories and offices. Their co-operation has never failed to secure some result. I know because I have watched and assisted such co-operation in more cities and industries than I could possibly give an off-handed list of. There has never been, as far as I have been able to observe, any desire on the part of working men to take the lion's share of the benefits from working women. On the contrary, in fact, the moment the girls would show any ability or determination for their betterment the men were anxious to be with them step for step in the struggle and to share the later benefits with absolute impartiality. In that respect the privilege of the vote could not have improved things—in the class with which I have dealt, at least."

The feud among female suffragists is not to be regarded seriously or not so seriously as some of the antis would like

to regard it. Yet now and then some more or less careless utterance of a suff adds interest to the situation if not gaiety of all the nations.

MISS EMMELINE PITT, A PHILADELPHIA WAGE-EARNER, SAYS:

"The pink teas, the Newport conferences at \$5 admission, the auto tours and the bequest of millions to the 'cause' are all evidences to the woman who earns her own living that the 'suffrage trust' is interested in nothing but a selfish proposition to grant political authority to a clique of hysterical social leaders who have become surfeited with the exercise of every power in woman's sphere and wish to usurp the position of men, merely because it is the only thing they have not done.

"The professional suffrage agitator, like the professional socialist, is not the woman who works, but the semi-educated amateur who believes that one or two quick changes in law making would bring about high wages, reduce the cost of living and act as a panacea for the ills of all mankind.

"Working women have no such illusions. It is the woman of leisure who seeks political leadership for her own amusement, who prattles of the 8,000,000 working women who demand the ballot—and doesn't take the trouble to learn that there are only 654,000 suffragists in America, according to their own admission.

"Working women do not want to vote, but a square deal, and none of the professional reformers by way of the ballot ever come down to earth and propose anything definite to make the lot of the woman who works easier. It is rather nonsensical to tell the working woman in store, factory or shop that all she needs is a vote to increase her income and be happy, when she already knows that women themselves are her hardest taskmakers.

"The marked preference women show for the duller and most unremunerative factory work rather than engage as domestics is all the evidence anyone needs to prove that women have not shown themselves as considerate of their employees as men. Why don't these arch reformers who seek the ballot, as they pretend, to benefit the working girl outside the home use whatever administration ability they think they have to first solve the 'servant girl problem'?"

THE CHILD HAS ITS RIGHTS

"My objection, of course, is based on the welfare of the child, I take the old view that it is a man's business to support his family and a woman's to make her home. A woman is never a drug on the home as she is on the market. Women really aren't wanted in business or politics. People don't have the confidence in them that they have in men. They need pull in politics—but they always have pull with a child."—Mrs. JOHN MARTIN.

* * * * We contend that never in the history of politics has any party made such large and varied and overwhelming promises to gain votes as has the National Association for Equal Suffrage and the Woman's Congressional Union, and that it will take them until the millennium to make good their promises; and therefore their futility is apparent; and that until this association can control its own members on these and kindred points, it has not the vital force to entitle it to change our established Constitution by any such disturbing amendment as that proposed, especially at a time in the world's history when we need all the stability and responsibility of our form of government to meet and stay the upheaval of world powers now trembling in the balance.

If ever our country is to prove the superiority of her faith, her Government, and her ideals, now is the appointed time, and it is not for her women, the cradle of her race, to tear down her safeguards, but, rather, it is their duty to conserve and strengthen her in "quietness and confidence."

Mrs. John R. Emery, President of the Morristown Branch of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Anti-suffragist campaigners, men as well as women, now see clearly, the men a little less clearly than the women, that it is a favorite trick of the suffragists to prefer to debate with men, rather than women; this for the reason that the men will be so gallant and agreeable about it all. There are women aplenty, however, who will attend to the case of the suffragist debaters.

Some Interesting Statistics

By Frank Foxcroft

The suffragists insist that better legislation will certainly follow the giving of the ballot to women.

Men, they say, are indifferent to the interests of women and children. They care nothing about child labor. They do not think anything about sanitation, of food adulteration, or pure milk, or factory regulation, or the social evil, or dozens of other things which women have at heart. Give women the ballot, it is said, and all these things will be taken care of by the "mothering influence" of women.

But, if all this is true, why is it that the suffrage States have not found it out? Why are they not giving women some conspicuous share in the work of law-making?

Here is Wyoming, which has had woman suffrage for forty-six years. Are women numerous in the Wyoming Legislature? Hardly. There is not a single woman among the twenty-seven Senators, and only one among the fifty-seven members of the House.

Here is Colorado, which has had woman suffrage for twenty-two years, Helen Ring Robinson, who was extensively advertised by the suffragists last year as the only woman who had ever been elected a State Senator, is still the only Senator in the Colorado Senate, and there is only one woman in the House.

California teems with new ideas, and

gives its voters a ballot four feet long, loaded with referendum proposals and constitutional amendments. But all of the 120 members of its Legislature are mere men.

The same thing is true of the 165 members of the Kansas Legislature.

Even in Utah, where women were given the ballot in order to strengthen the Mormon Church, there are no women in the Senate, and only two in the House.

Altogether, an examination of the official lists of members of the Legislatures in the nine States where women were voting last November shows a singular indifference to the value of women law-makers.

Here are the figures:

	Members of Legislatures.	Women members.
Arizona	54	2
California	120	0
Colorado	100	2
Idaho	94	1
Kansas	165	0
Oregon	90	2
Utah	63	2
Washington	138	0
Wyoming	84	1
	908	10

In view of the fact that but a trifle more than one per cent. of the legislative membership is composed of women, in the suffrage States, what becomes of the suffrage argument of the need of "mothering influence" in lawmaking?

The suffragists could not even sell very many copies of their own special editions of the newspapers, and it is rumored that some of these publications are rather tired of their votes-for-women lapses, anyway.

Of course old Solomon and his thousand wives would have been for female suffrage if he had had any such organization back of him as the Mormon Church.

Criticism, Clippings, or Comment?

The ballot, says Mabel Boardman, head of the American Red Cross, has not proved a cure-all for existing evils with men, and I find no reason to assume that it would be more effectual with women.

The basis of government, writes Rabbi Joseph Silverman, is force—its stability rests upon its physical power to enforce its laws; therefore it is inexpedient to give the vote to women. Immunity from service in executing the law would make most women irresponsible voters.

And here is Mr. Murphy arguing in favor of woman suffrage because women buy 85 per cent of all the goods purchased "for ultimate consumption," evidently forgetting, as many another Mr. Murphy probably has done, that it is the Old Man, after all, who still expects his pockets to be rifled for the wherewithal.

"Don't talk to me about women," said Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, superintendent of the Chicago schools, after the recent primary in that town. "I always knew that if women got into politics you never could tell what they would do. They are worse than men."

The Woman's Homestead Association of Massachusetts proposed a \$5 yearly tax on bachelors, because of the "alarming increase of single men who have plural wives," thus indicating, possibly, that the real destination of the Woman's Homestead Association is the ultimate suffragist and feminist manless home.

It has been decided recently that a wife is entitled to the money that she earns. But it doesn't follow from this that the Old Man is going to be mean enough to limit her to this.

"Any effort," says the Philadelphia *Ledger*, "to guard the voting body from an influx of ignorant and incompetent citizens, from men without the capacity or the desire to understand the nature of our form of government, from the masses who are the prey and strength of venal politicians, would receive the approval and support of thoughtful men everywhere."

All true enough, if one wishes to be frank and thoroughly truthful. Yet there are some who would double or perhaps treble the number of ignorant and incompetent citizens, to make them the prey and strength of venal politicians.

The New York County Woman Suffrage Association has an ambitious but not a too ambitious program. It is to secure women judges, lawyers, probation officers, policewomen, clerks, etc., for women's and children's courts.

The following is a fairly good example of Dr. Anna Howard Shaw's marvelous power of moderate statement:

"Opponents of woman's suffrage are forced to admit to-day that they do not believe in the Republican form of government in our Constitution, or a bill of rights, and are afraid to trust the people."

Miss Alice Gerstenberg, dramatizer of "Alice in Wonderland," is right about one thing. "It is about as foolish," she says, "for me, who am trying to be a dramatist, to make a suffrage speech as the things in 'Alice in Wonderland' are."

Anti-Suffrage Organizations

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

OFFICERS

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President, New York.
Mrs. William B. Glover, Secretary, Fairfield, Conn.
Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Treasurer, Glen Ridge, N. J.
Miss Minnie Bronson, General Secretary, 37 West 39th street, New York.

STATE ASSOCIATIONS.

CONNECTICUT

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, President.
Mrs. Walter S. Schulz, Secretary, 242 North Beacon street, Hartford.

IOWA

Mrs. John Flynn, President.
Mrs. Simon Casady, Secretary, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MARYLAND

Mrs. Robert Garrett, President, Baltimore.
Mrs. Claude Hall, Recording Secretary, Baltimore.

MAINE

Mrs. Sidney W. Thacher, Portland.
Mrs. George S. Hobbs, Secretary, 48 Neal street, Portland.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. James M. Codman, President, Brookline.
Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Corresponding Secretary, 687 Boylston street, Boston.

MICHIGAN

Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, President.
Miss Helen E. Keep, Secretary, 753 Jefferson avenue, Detroit.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mrs. A. T. Dudley, President, Exeter.
Miss Grace Morrill, Cor. Secretary, Concord.

NEW JERSEY

Mrs. Edward Yarde Breese, President.
Miss Elizabeth R. Hendrickson, Corresponding Secretary.

Paterson Branch

Mrs. Thomas Graham, Chairman.
Mrs. C. R. Smith, Secretary.

NEW YORK

Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, President.
Mrs. M. E. Loomis, Secretary, 37 West 39th street.

OHIO

Mrs. H. E. Talbot, President, Dayton.
The Cincinnati and Hamilton County Association
Mrs. W. Austin Goodman, President.
Mrs. Louis T. More, Secretary.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 261 So. 15th street, Philadelphia
Mrs. Horace Brock, President.
Miss Laura M. Sloan, General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer.

Pittsburgh Association

Mrs. Julia Morgan Harding, President.
Mrs. Winslow Crannell, Secretary.

VERMONT

Mrs. Brookes Brown, President.
Mrs. M. H. Buckham, Secretary, Burlington.

RHODE ISLAND

Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, President.
Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Secretary, 7 Cooke street, Providence.

Newport Branch

Mrs. Charles Weaver, Chairman.
Mrs. Ernest Howe, Secretary.

VIRGINIA

Miss Jane M. Rutherford, President.
Mrs. Charles M. Ferrell, Secretary, 1616 Grove avenue, Richmond.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1402 H street, N. W.
Mrs. Augustus P. Gardner, President.
Miss Ester Denny, Corresponding Secretary.

WISCONSIN

Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt, President.
Miss Genevieve Mills, Corresponding Secretary, 222 Monona avenue, Madison.

NEBRASKA

Omaha Branch
Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Temporary Chairman.
Mrs. William Archibald Smith, Secretary.

THE GUIDON CLUB.

Opposed to Woman Suffrage

45 East Thirty-fourth Street, New York

FOUNDER AND HONORARY PRESIDENT

Mrs. Rossiter Johnson.

PRESIDENT

Miss Caroline M. Holmes.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

Mrs. William Forse Scott.

Mrs. Charles H. Denison.

Mrs. Henry Seligman.

RECORDING SECRETARY

Miss Toma Lewis.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

Miss Henrietta Jesup.

TREASURER

Rossiter Johnson.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

James, Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore.

Rev. James M. Bruce, D. D.

Gen. James Lowell Carter.

Hon. John D. Crimmins.

Arthur Randolph Green, M. D.

Gen. Nelson H. Henry.

John Bessner Huber, M. D.

Col. John P. Irish.

Rossiter Johnson, LL. D.

Charles R. Lamb, Esq.

Hon. Aaron Jefferson Levy.

Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D. D.

Theron George Strong, Esq.

Mrs. Martha Moore Avery.

Mrs. Clarence Beebe.

Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin.

Mrs. Annie Nathan Meyer.

Mrs. William Packer Prentice

Miss Molly Elliott Seawell.

Mrs. Henry Seligman.

Mrs. Bayard Taylor.

Mrs. E. Payson Terhune.

Mrs. Brinton Cox.

Mrs. William Cogswell.

Rev. F. J. Prettyman.

New York Wage Earners' Anti-Suffrage League

Alice Edith Abell, President
Vice-President, Edith Drescher
Secretary, Marjorie Dorman

Man-Suffrage Association

27 William Street, New York
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Everett P. Wheeler, Chairman
Fritz Achells Frank L. Babbott
Vernon C. Brown John R. Dos Passos
Charles S. Fairchild George Douglas Miller
Herbert L. Satterlee Louis T. Romaine
Prof. Munroe Smith John C. Ten Eyck
Francis Lynde Stetson Gilbert M. Tucker
Dr. Talcott Williams George W. Seligman
Arthur G. Somers

Secretary, Arthur B. Church

The Citadel Club, Yonkers, N. Y.

President, John C. Ten Eyck
Secretary, Francis A. Repplier
Treasurer, Fred'k H. Poor

Pennsylvania Men's League Opposed to Woman's Suffrage

President, S. Davis Page
Vice-Presidents, Francis Howard Williams
and W. W. Frazier
Secretary, Rev. Ed. Jas. McHenry
Treasurer, John Wilson Brown, Jr.

DIRECTORS

John Wilson Brown, Jr.
John Cadwallader, Jr.
W. D. Winsor
Chas. I. Wilkinson
Chas. W. MacFarlane, M. D.
Francis Rawle
Theodore M. Elting
Horace Howard Fuones, Jr.
Ed. James McHenry

ENGLAND

The National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage

Headquarters: 515 Caxton House, Tothill street, Westminster, S. W., London.

Organ: The Anti-Suffrage Review, Annual Subscription 1/6

Presidents, Earl Curzon of Kedleston; Lord Weardale. Deputy-Presidents, the Countess of Jersey; Lady Robson. Chairman of Executive Committee, E. A. Mitchell-Innes, Esq., K. C. Hon. Treasurer, J. Massie, Esq. Hon. Secretary, Miss Gladys Pott. Assistant Secretary, Miss Helen Page.

Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, Toronto, Canada

Mrs. George Cassels, 265 Poplar Plains Road, Treasurer; Miss Laing, 28 Dunvegan Road, Recording Secretary; Miss Plummer, Sylvan Tower, Corresponding Secretary.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Lady Aylesworth	Mrs. C. A. Moss
Mrs. E. N. Bate	" Guy Robinson
" James S. Cartwright	" H. S. Strathy
" W. Hodgson Ellis	" McIlwraith
" Hay	" E. L. Morton
" Loosemore	" Warren
" R. A. Lyon	Miss Campbell
" Graham Thompson	" Macdonell
" A. VanKoughnet	" Ethel Wright

The Girls' Anti-Suffrage League London, England

President, Miss Ermine M. K. Taylor
Hon. Treasurer and Hon. Secretary, Miss Elsie Hird Morgan, 15 Philbeach Garden's, Earl's Court.

The Scottish League for Opposing Woman Suffrage

Presidents, The Duchess of Montrose, LL. D.; Mrs. Charles Lyell, Lord Glenconner, Sir John Stirling Maxwell, Bart.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Helen Rutherford, M. A.; Mrs. Wauchope, of Niddrie.
Finance Committee, Sir Hugh Shaw Stewart, Bart.; Professor J. H. Millar, William Laughland, Esq.; C. N. Johnston, Esq., K. C.

Secretary, Miss Gemmell, Central Office, 10 Queensberry, Edinburgh.

The All-India League for Opposing Woman Suffrage

President, Mrs. Ellys Walton
Vice-President, Mrs. Johnson
Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. A. Priestley
Hon. Secretary, Miss DeGruyther
Secretary, Miss E. Newman, Hazel Dell, Mussorie

NOTICE.

All Clubs, or Societies with the above object in view are asked to send reports of their work to this department. Reports must be received by the 10th of the month.

Hints by May Manton



8060 Girl's Long Waisted Dress,
8 to 12 years.

WITH LONG OR SHORT SLEEVES.

Two important features of the latest styles are to be found in this frock, the belt at the low waist line and the slightly open neck with the chemisette effect. The frock is as pretty and smart as can be and, at the same time, absolutely simple. The plain blouse and straight skirt are gathered and joined one to the other. A belt covers the seam and the closing is made all the way down the front so that, when washable materials are used, laundering is a simple matter. The sleeves are stitched to the armholes. Striped challis is the material illustrated and it is trimmed with the same material in plain color. Frocks of this kind, however, can be made from washable materials or from the cashmere that is so much used, or from French serge as well as from the challis.

For the 10 year size, the dress will require $3\frac{1}{8}$ yards of material 27, $2\frac{5}{8}$ yards 36, $3\frac{1}{8}$ yards 4 inches wide with $7\frac{1}{8}$ yards 27 for the trimming.

The pattern of the dress 8060 is cut in sizes for girls from 8 to 12 years of age. It will be mailed to any address by the Fashion Department of this paper, on receipt of ten cents.

These patterns will be mailed to any address by "The Reply," on receipt of ten cents for each. Address "The Reply," 33 W. 34th St., New York.

J. B. Thill
and
Mrs. Edmond W. Bodine
Real Estate

192 Main Street
NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.
Telephone 848

30 East Forty-Second Street
NEW YORK CITY
Telephone 6364 Murray Hill

FOR SALE.—Farm at Wilton, Conn., one mile from railroad station; ten acres, fruit, brook, garden and orchard; picturesque old house in good repair, two barns, beautiful trees; easy terms. Apply to The Reply, Box 1526, New Canaan.

FOR SALE.—Beautiful unfurnished country house, built by owner for occupancy; situated at end of village street on high ground, about $\frac{1}{2}$ acre; unusual flower and vegetable gardens, shrubs and trees; house has ten rooms and bath, open fireplaces, steam heat, electric lights. Price, \$11,000. Address P. O. Box 77, New Canaan, Conn.

WILL EXCHANGE three city lots, steadily increasing in value, for farm from 20 to 50 acres, in Orange county, New York. Address The Reply, 33 West 42d street, New York.

WANTED—ABANDONED FARM of 100 acres, stream, good trees, old-fashioned house, inland, high country; must be very cheap. Address I. C., The Reply, 33 West 42d street, New York.

If you love the beautiful the trip to Mt. Vernon is worth taking just to see the **George Lots**, the **Elm Trees** thereon and the **George Cottage**, a gem of the Colonial period—quaint and dainty—built in 1736, and occupied by the **George** family since 1842.

SEE THE ELMS

SEE THE LOTS

SEE THE COTTAGE

AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

SEE THE SCHOOLS

SEE THE CHURCHES

SEE THE RAILROADS

AND MOUNT VERNON

See it all for then you'll know it's charming and we'll see you call and buy—buy to build or buy to sell or buy to save.

SEE US AT THE

George Cottage

on the Kingsbridge Road

Georgetown, Mt. Vernon

HANNAH GEORGE, Spokesman

Or ask our Lawyers, **BUTTS & VINING**, 51 Chambers Street, NEW YORK CITY

Parcels Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write, as well as visit our advertisers



"The Oldest Tea Room in New York"

THE FERNERY

22 EAST 33rd STREET

TEL. 2297 M H

(Between Fifth and Madison Avenues)

TABLE D'HOTE OR A LA CARTE 8 A. M. TO 8 P. M.

Breakfast, 35c., 50c.
Special Luncheon, 65c.

Tea with Waffles, 30c.
Chicken Dinner, 50c. to \$1.00

MISS S. M. TUCKER, Prop.

Always quiet and restful, though within 1 block of Altman's, the Waldorf, the Subway.

REPRESENTATIVE WANTED

For The Reply

We want a representative in every community for THE REPLY and will pay a liberal commission for every new subscriber added to our list. Also cash prizes for every fifty subscriptions.

This is a splendid opportunity for some one to earn a little extra money. If there is no agent in your town, can you suggest some one with whom we can correspond.

Name of Possible Representative

Address

For further particulars write

THE REPLY 33 W 42d St.,
New York.

The Congress Woman

by

Mrs. Isabel Gordon Curtis

Published by Brown & Howell Co.
Chicago.

Will appear late in March
Order Now Through "The Reply."

THE REPLY'S SUFFRAGE CANVASS

Help us to learn the Will of the People by answering the following question and mailing to "THE REPLY," 33 W. 42d St., New York.

Do You Want Woman Suffrage for the United States?

Signature

Address

Date

Result will be published July 1914

Parcels Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write, as well as visit our advertisers

Good Reading—Recent Books

The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage Sir Almroth E. Wright, M. D., F. R. S.	\$1.00
The Vocation of Woman Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun MacMillan	\$1.50
Woman and the Republic Helen Kendrick Johnson. Price, by mail	80c.
The Unrest of Women Edward Sanford Martin. D. Appleton & Co.	\$1.00
Votes for Men Duffield Co.	50c.
The Ladies Battle Molly Elliott Seawell. McMillan Co.	\$1.00
Woman Adrift Harold Owen. E. P. Dutton & Co.	\$1.50
Anti-Suffrage. Ten Good Reasons Grace Duffield Goodwin. Duffield Co.	50c.
The Business of Being a Woman Ida M. Tarbell. McMillan Co.	\$1.25
The Wrong and Peril of Woman Suffrage James M. Buckley, LL. D. Fleming H. Revell Co.	75c.
A Miscellany of Men Gilbert Chesterton. Dodd Mead Co.	\$1.50
Mixed Herbs U. S. Agents, The Reply, by mail	55c.
An English Woman's Home U. S. Agents, The Reply, by mail	50c.

Magazines

The Woman's Protest Published monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, 37 West 39th Street, New York. Single copies, 10c.; subscription price, \$1 per year.	
The Remonstrance Published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston. Subscription price, 25c. per year.	
Anti-Suffrage Review 515 Caxton House, Westminster, London, Eng. Single copies, one penny; subscription price, 1/6.	
The Trained Nurse Published monthly by the Lakeside Pub. Co., 38-40 West 32d Street, New York. Single copies, 20c.; subscription price, \$2 per year.	
Glaube und Tat A German evangelical monthly. Taubenstrasse, 23 Frankfort-on-Main.	
Monatsblatt des Deutschen Bundes zur Bekaempfung der Frauenemanzipation Rubenstrasse 21, Berlin-Friedenau.	
The Live Issue Published weekly by the Social Reform Press, 131 East 23d Street, New York City. Subscription rates, one year, 50c.	
Housewives League Magazine Published monthly by the Housewives League Magazine, Inc., 31 East 27th Street, New York. Single copies, 10c.; subscription price, \$1 per year.	

Any advertiser or intending advertiser who wishes to reach a body of 12,000 intelligent and earnest men and women such as might naturally be supposed to follow a magazine like *The Reply* are invited to write us for particulars in reference to our special advertising proposition.

THE REPLY
27 William St., New York

ELBERT HUBBARD made a little journey to the Atlas press clipping community. If you want to read of something new and original, send 10c. for this Journey, to Charles Hemstreet, 216 East 42nd Street, New York City.

WOMAN AND THE **REPUBLIC**

A survey of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the United States and Discussion of the Claims and Arguments of its Foremost Advocates

By

Helen Kendrick Johnson

12 mo., 359 pages

Price, 25 cents; postage, 10 cents

Published by

The Guidon Club

45 East 34th St., New York

THE MAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION, 27 William Street, New York, Room 1823, issues the following publications:

1. The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, Jan. 26, 1914. By Everett P. Wheeler
2. Questionnaire to Professors in Universities and Colleges. By Professor Munroe Smith.
3. Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound. By Professor William T. Sedgwick.
4. Brief Before the Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Dec. 1913. By Everett P. Wheeler.
5. Brief Submitted to House of Representatives. July, 1914. By Everett P. Wheeler.
6. Colorado and Suffrage. By John C. Ten Eyck.
7. Consent of the Governed. By Prof. Munroe Smith.
8. The Woman Suffrage Crisis. Editorial New York Times, February 8, 1915.
9. Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals.
10. The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman. By Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar.
11. What Women Have Done Without the Ballot. By Everett P. Wheeler. (Republished by Permission from *The Reply*.)

Suffrage Map of the United States.

Anti-Suffrage. By Grace Duffield Goodwin. 35cts.

The Man Suffrage Association also keeps in stock publications of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Parcels Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write as well as visit our advertisers?

Meyer London, Socialist Congressman, announces that from now to the end of the campaign all his energies will be devoted to securing votes for women. He is for the Revolution.

The New York Daily Call, leading organ of the Socialists in this country, declares that a million Socialist voters are mobilizing for Female Suffrage. They are for the Revolution.

The men of the State of New York and of the other campaign states are beginning to rouse themselves to the peril to our institutions involved in this natural alliance of the two chief revolutionary agitations of the day.

But they need to do more. Leaders in education, in business, in public affairs, in family affairs, need to enlist for the war to defend our form of government. Socialists and Suffragists are indeed mobilizing.

If you can help The Reply, or if The Reply can help you, please write us without delay. Send names and addresses. Send suggestions. Send material for publication. Send subscriptions.

THE REPLY

27 William Street, New York

in-
gn
tes

of
on
ge.

the
m-
in
ary

du-
nily
our
are

ply
end
end

ork

izers?